

It is vital for the business future of this country, for the home heating efficiency of this country, for an economy that is reliable, we need reliable supplies of all kinds of energy. It will not be easy. We are going to have to do a lot of things differently than we are today. We will have to change a lot of our priorities. It is vital to the future of this country.

If there is one thing in my view that threatens the economic future of America, it is the lack of reliable, affordable energy prices that our businesses and our homes and people can use to fuel their homes and our businesses. Without that, our economy will be very difficult.

ENERGY CHALLENGES FACING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for one-half the time remaining until midnight, or approximately 40 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor tonight to talk about the energy challenges facing America and the opportunities that we now have before America and to advise the House that this afternoon, along with support of about 40 Members of the U.S. House, I introduced an amendment to the underlying energy bill which could be on the floor tomorrow that would give America a new Apollo Energy Project that would give America an energy program that is befitting the boldness and can-do spirit of this country. I will come back, in a moment, to explain why it is called the Apollo Energy Project.

Before I do, I thought I should address what the challenges are to America and our energy world. They are three. They are really quite obvious, and I think that they are well understood by Americans and accepted by Americans on a consensus basis.

Challenge number one: Our Nation has an addiction.

We are addicted to oil from the Mideast. We are addicted to oil from one of the most turbulent, incendiary, dangerous parts of the planet in the last couple of centuries. This addiction, in all administrations, Democrat and Republican, has resulted in a foreign policy not to the security interests of America and not to the interests of spreading democracy in the Middle East.

Americans understand that, both in their head and in their gut, because they know that the policies, for instance, in Majlis, in the Saudi Arabian Royal House, is they have refused to cooperate fully in the war on terrorism and in fact have allowed certain elements in their society to support terrorism without cracking down on it. Americans understand that the reason for that is because of our addiction to Middle Eastern oil, and they realize that our foreign policy has been tainted,

has been poisoned, by this addiction. And Americans understand that breaking that addiction perhaps is job number one for an energy policy of America. That is the first challenge.

The second challenge is to deal with the phenomena of global warming. Americans now have come to understand overwhelmingly that when we place into the atmosphere pollutants from our burning of fossil fuels, by necessity these pollutants have caused a huge proliferation of global gas emissions to increase the rate of these gases that warm the planet and the atmosphere.

Americans know if we are going to continue to burn fossil fuels without using new technologies to trap these pollutants, we are going to continue to increase the increase of carbon dioxide and methane and other global warming gasses in the atmosphere. Americans know if we do that, that these gasses are sort of like a blanket, they trap infrared radiation escaping the Earth and will be warming the planet for the next century.

Americans are concerned when they see what has happened as a result of global warming already. They know that in Glacier National Park, where we had 150 glaciers about 100 years ago, we now have 50, and we are projected to have no glaciers, no glaciers, in Glacier National Park in the next century if trends continue. We will have to rename it "Puddle Natural Park" I suppose.

Americans have seen the melting of the polar ice caps, the reduction by 10 percent in breadth and 40 percent in depth of the arctic ice cap; the melting of tundra in Alaska, where dead Indians are popping up out of graveyards because the tundra has melted.

□ 2230

We have seen the extraordinary increase in dangerous weather in the continental United States that is associated or could be associated with this phenomenon. We know that we have a responsibility to our children to stop our proliferation and contribution of these global warming gases and that we can do so. That is the second challenge.

The third challenge is an economic one, and the challenge is that we know that technologies always are continuing to grow, and we know that because of this challenge in the Mideast with oil and because of global warming, people are going to want new technologies for new sources of energy. The problem is that we have kind of a gap, we have a technology gap, because we are losing jobs right now in the new energy technologies to Germany for solar, as Germany now is the leading solar manufacturer of solar chips; to Japan with hybrid vehicles, as Japan is now leading us in the production of fuel-efficient vehicles; and to Denmark, a small European country that now is leading the world in the production of wind turbines, and these are

jobs that belong right here in the United States, not to be lost to our economic competitors. We have a job loss phenomenon because we do not have an energy policy that is forward-thinking. We have an energy policy that looks backwards.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, we offered an amendment for a new, bold, visionary energy policy, and we call it the New Apollo Energy Project. We did that, inspired by a former member of the U.S. Congress who, on May 9, 1951, walked down this aisle right here and he walked up to the platform and addressed a joint session of the U.S. Congress of the United States. That night, John F. Kennedy challenged America to go to the moon within 10 years and bring that man back safely to earth. At the time, he challenged America to exercise its can-do spirit. People thought that was a little bit nuts, to send, at the time they were thinking of a man, to the moon and bring him back within 10 years. That idea stunned people at the precursor of NASA thinking, how the heck are we going to do that?

But John Kennedy knew something about the character of America. He knew that when Americans recognized a challenge and were rallied to a cause, they could produce like no culture in human history, and this American culture responded with technological innovations which led the world in using our can-do spirit to create new devices, new software, new computers, new rockets, new navigational systems, new satellites that were unheard of before John Kennedy asked America to accept that challenge.

That is exactly the type of challenge which we need to give to America tomorrow when we adopt an energy policy.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I have, along with my colleagues, offered this New Apollo Energy Project is because unfortunately, the underlying bill that we seek to amend is timid, it is slow, it is too little, it is too late, and it is a package deserving of some country less than America, because it fails to cut the mustard in dealing with the 3 fundamental challenges of energy that this country is facing.

Number 1, it fails to give America any hope whatsoever to break that addiction to middle eastern oil. Second, it fails to give America any hope that it is going to deal successfully with this challenge of global warming. Third, it fails to give America any hope that we are going to bring those jobs back to America that now are going across the waters to countries that recognize, are recognizing these new potentially job-creating economies.

So we have introduced this New Apollo Energy Project to introduce those 3 challenges.

I want to discuss the difference between this proposal, which we would be proposing at this moment by Democratic Members of the House, and we hope that Republicans will join us tomorrow or the next day when this bill

is voted on; I would like to talk about the differences between the New Apollo Energy Project and what I believe must be characterized as a timid, half-measure project that is in the underlying bill.

The first thing that our New Apollo Energy Project will give America are goals. I guess it has been said by other folks, if you do not know where you are going, you will probably get there. We need to have goals like Kennedy set for us in 1961, because unless we set those goals, we will surely muddle along and not make significant progress.

So what we have done in this bill with this amendment, which will be on the floor tomorrow, we hope, we have set some goals for America and we have set these goals so that they are both ambitious and reasonably achievable. And we have set these goals by looking at the existing technology, looking at what we have today, looking at the scientists and the scientific evaluations that seemingly may be possible in the future. Let me address some of those goals.

Number 1, we have set a goal that by the year 2010, America will adopt, and the President will help implement through very flexible means at his discretion or her discretion, the goal of reducing Americans' dependence on oil in our total energy package by 600,000 barrels of oil a day by 2010 and a little over 2 million barrels a day by 2015. Now, why do we pick those numbers? We do so out of an acute recognition of the costs of our addiction to Middle Eastern oil. The first figure of 2010, if we reach this target, which I believe is imminently achievable through ways I will talk about in a moment, we will replace the amount of oil that will be produced by Iraq. If we meet this goal by 2015, we will eliminate the need for the oil produced by Saudi Arabia, essentially the largest producer in the world.

Now, why is this important? It is important because right now, we already are depending on 55 percent of our oil coming from foreign sources, and that is expected to rise over 60 percent by the end of the decade. Half of that comes from the Mideast. That is the addiction we have to break.

So we have set this realistic goal, and if we look at the Department of Energy assessments, we will see that this is a realistic goal.

The second goal. We have set forth a goal for America, which again is a reasonable and achievable one, to reduce our contributions to global warming gases that we put out from burning fossil fuel by the year 2010 to essentially 1990 levels, of what we were putting out in 1990.

Now, that is less ambitious than the Kyoto Treaty. It is less ambitious than most other civilized nations have agreed to in the Kyoto Treaty. But we have sought to have a goal that every single Member of this House ought to be able to embrace. If folks do not like the Kyoto Treaty, then they ought to

agree with us to set some goal, and we have put on the table the goal, the democratic folks who have been working on this bill, and I hope my Republican colleagues will rise to the challenge and embrace this goal for America. Because if they do not, they are dooming our kids to a place that is different than we knew when we grew up.

We are telling our kids that they can just accept 2 to 8 degree increases of global mean temperatures over the next decade. We can expect them to see the increase of infectious diseases move north: Malaria, encephalitis, Dengue Fever. We can expect to see droughts in the western United States, somewhat similar to what we have experienced in the last 2 or 3 years. We can expect to see a lessening of the snow pack in the Cascade Mountains, which can reduce the ability to irrigate our fields in eastern Washington. We can expect to have an America that is not the kind that we had when we were children. We need to set this goal.

Third, we would set a goal of creating 1 million new jobs in these new infant industries which can be so beneficial in helping America reach their economic potential. Wind turbines, solar, clean coal, thermal incline facilities using the thermal temperatures in the oceans, energy efficiency systems, efficient cars. All of these, a whole basket full of new jobs for Americans that ought to be here rather than Denmark, Japan, and Germany. So we intend to set those goals and we have done so.

The second feature of our plan. We know that this is an ambitious challenge. Let me tell my colleagues how ambitious it is. Three weeks ago, or 2 weeks ago, an article came out in Science Magazine that suggested that by the end of this century, if we were to expect to hold the rate of global warming to about 2 degrees over the next century, to just limit it to that amount, not stop it, but limit it to that amount, we would have to have somewhere between three-quarters and 100 percent of our energy produced by nonCO₂-emitting industries. That is a big challenge. Now, it is over a century, but it is still a big challenge. So this is an ambitious undertaking that we have to face for a variety of reasons.

So in doing that, we need to embrace a whole host of solutions. There are no silver bullets to our energy policy. But we have to be bold and visionary and break the habits of our old ways and our old industries, at times, in order to reach these goals of more self reliance in energy.

So let me talk about some of the ways we propose doing it. First, let me say we want to address new sources of energy and we want to address old sources of energy. Let me address the new ones just first briefly, because they are things that are not yet seen, just like in the 1890s, the internal combustion motor was only a tiny part of our total energy consumption, our production. And if we looked at charts, we

would say, well, is the internal combustion engine going to mean much to America? At the turn of the century, it was only a few percentage points of our production, but it changed us dramatically. The same can be said, I believe, of the new emerging technologies that can help produce energy. Wind energy and wind turbines.

Mr. Speaker, wind turbines now are economically competitive with electricity produced by other means. We are building the North America's largest wind turbine farm in southeastern Washington, enough to supply energy for thousands of homes at a competitive price. And the Department of Energy studies have shown that the potential for wind energy, assuming that this becomes economically productive, as much as in the Midwest alone could potentially generate enough electricity for United States consumption needs. Now, those prices are becoming competitive, particularly with the modest tax breaks that the industry now takes advantage of.

This is happening around the world. When I was in Denmark a couple years ago, I saw them producing 15 percent of all of their electricity with wind turbines, some of these 300 foot-long blades that are outside on the ocean, outside of Copenhagen. They intend to have 50 percent of their electric produced by wind power by the end of the decade, and they are going to reach that. We have that alternative to do also, if we will give this industry some of the modest help to get off the floor and get into the mass-scale production that we need. I look forward to that day.

Solar power. Solar power at this moment is not economically competitive at this moment, except in certain circumstances. But the facts have shown that every time we increase the rate of production of solar units, the price can get cut by as much as half, and we believe, by ramping up, by obtaining the scales of economy of production of these solar units, we believe they have a realistic possibility of being economically productive by the end of the decade, if, if Uncle Sam will pull its head out of the sand on this issue and help this emerging technology along.

Now, there are just a couple of new technologies, but let me talk about some of the old. Coal. Coal right now, we have enormous supplies of coal in this country as a domestic fuel supply, but a problem with it is that at the moment, it contributes enormous pollutants in the form of carbon dioxide, which is one of the global warming gases that we have that are so problematic for the future climate of the world.

□ 2245

The question arises, why do we not just trap the carbon dioxide? Let us trap it. The fancy word for that is sequestration. We in our bill have put research and development dollars in to study the opportunity of trapping or

doing carbon dioxide sequestration and perhaps injecting it back into deep mines or potentially the ocean, although there are environmental challenges there, to try to be able to use coal without marring the atmosphere.

There are some real challenges to doing that technologically; but given the enormous challenge we have over the next century, it seems to me that it is an appropriate expenditure of research dollars to see if we can make progress in that regard.

One of the simple things to say about energy is that the best way to produce energy is to use it efficiently. I believe a very significant portion of our solution to our energy needs, although not talked about, although not quite as romantic as wind, solar, or various other fusion technologies and the like, it is going to be a very significant part of our savings, and that is to use energy efficiently.

Let me tell Members how important that is. Look at Seattle, Washington. I come from Seattle, and represent the north Seattle area. Seattle, Washington realized it was going to start to have an energy crunch in the mid-1990s. The folks in Seattle, instead of just rushing out and producing more CO₂ emissions, they decided to see what they could do to use energy efficiently.

They adopted some very common-sense measures in Seattle to have incentives for better building code standards, to have incentives to use energy-saving lighting, to have incentives to use energy in a more efficient way for advertising, for instance; very simple things.

The city of Seattle saved enough energy, enough electricity, to heat and light 58,000 homes in about 3 to 4 years; 58,000 homes in a city of 1,000,000 or thereabouts. That is an amazing statistic, doing something that did not change anyone's lifestyle in a deleterious manner. Everyone enjoyed the same lifestyle. Before the bubble burst, Seattle was a pretty chic place to live, and I still think it is a great spot, without any degradation of our lifestyle.

In our bill, we have called for a number of measures, essentially, to get efficiencies on how we use energy.

Look at our transportation sector. In transportation, we did some very far-sighted things in the 1970s. We adopted measures to raise the fuel economy of our fleet of vehicles, and it was successful. We raised it almost 10 miles a gallon, probably 8 miles a gallon or the like, in our fleets of vehicles.

Then, in the 1980s, that stopped. That rate of progress that America was making came to an absolute halt. It is interesting, because if we had simply continued to increase the rate of improvement of mileage in the cars we were driving through the 1980s and 1990s, we would have replaced all of the oil we buy from Saudi Arabia today.

Just think of the opportunity we lost in not continuing those efficiency increases. Now we have to start again on

the road to efficiency increases, and in our bill we have not proposed a specific efficiency standard, what is called the CAFE standard, the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standard; but we have created a goal that would give the President a flexible tool in one manner or another to save 600,000 barrels a day by the end of the decade, and that is a realistic goal. Heaven help us if we cannot use our brains enough to increase the efficiency of our transportation sector.

Since the 1980s, when America stopped because Congress stopped improving the fuel efficiency of our vehicles, since that time virtually the entire computer and Internet industries have developed, the biomedical industry has just essentially been created from scratch, and we have had these tremendous technological advances, but the cars we are driving get less mileage today than they did in 1984. That is simply wrong.

The Republican approach has not offered, in this bill, any solution to that failure; we have. I am hoping some of my Republican colleagues will join us in fixing that problem.

Let me address the hydrogen economy, if I can. Many of us were pleased to see the President in his State of the Union at least mention the possibility or the prospects of developing hydrogen-fueled vehicles. Many of us believe that is a bright future for the country to develop a fuel cell-driven car; but it is a ways off, of course, to develop the technologies, particularly for the infrastructure to fuel those cars.

Unfortunately, upon reflection, we found that the President's and my colleagues', the Republicans' plan, has this enormous loophole, this bridge between here and the future that is simply down. That is the bridge between us and the production of hydrogen; because we could have everybody in America have a hydrogen-fueled car in our garages, but it does not do us any good if we do not have any hydrogen. The President totally failed to give us a way to produce hydrogen. The Republican bill tomorrow gives us a total failure of a way to produce hydrogen.

What we found was this President's allusion to hydrogen was really a failed allusion of an energy policy. I regret to have to say that, because it is a biological fact hydrogen does not grow on trees; it has to be produced. It has to be produced through electrolysis of removing it from water molecules. We have to use electricity to do that. We have to have some way to generate the electricity, or it has to be stripped off from a fossil-based fuel system in some process which also takes energy.

So the fact of the matter is, although a hydrogen car is a good idea and the research to produce it is a good idea, we have to grab the bull by the horns and figure out how to produce hydrogen. The Republican Party is not telling us how to do that. We will offer proposals in our bill, in the New Apollo Energy Project, how to do it.

The reason we will do that, do all of these things, relies on a fundamental character belief in the "can do" spirit of America. If you believe in this new Apollo project, you are an optimist; if you do not, perhaps you are a pessimist.

We are optimists because we believe in the "can do" spirit of this country. When we roll up our sleeves, we get it done technologically, but we do not if the U.S. Congress sits here in the posture of an ostrich with the head in the sand and our tailfeathers in the wind, rather than the American eagle. That is the posture we want the U.S. Congress to take, of the eagle with a can do spirit.

Some of my colleagues earlier this evening were talking about one of the provisions in the Republican bill would purport to solve this problem by drilling in our Arctic wildlife refuge that was established as a wildlife refuge by Dwight David Eisenhower way back when. It was established to be a wildlife refuge. It has been one ever since.

I think that there are several comments I have to make, because I know a little bit about this. I was up in the Arctic wildlife refuge the summer before last. Just to give Members who have not been there a brief description of it, I have been to Yellowstone, I have been to Glacier National Park, and my parents used to work in Mount Rainier National Park in Washington State. I have been to the bayous of Louisiana and I have been to a lot of beautiful places in this country, but I can warrant in the 4 days I was camped on the banks of the Achelik River right next to the area they want to turn into an oil production facility, it is one of, if not the most, spectacularly biologically dynamic beautiful places in America.

The wildlife is spectacular like no place I have ever been, and for 24 hours a day, because the sun is up 23, 24 hours a day, there are birds singing, there are grizzly bears walking, there is caribou snorting going right through your camp. That place is the most spectacularly exciting place I have ever been, just to be.

For Members to come here and describe it as some sort of wasteland that we should toss aside like a piece of sort of litter from the American political structure is just wrong. It is a beautiful, beautiful place, and it is a special place. That is why a good Republican environmentalist, Dwight David Eisenhower, set it aside for future generations as a wildlife refuge.

A couple of things about this. Number one, although we know increasing production domestically is an element of this, and we have in our bill proposed increasing domestic production of oil in some of our wells, we have some tax incentives to improve the efficiency and productivity of what are called marginal or stripper wells that are now in marginal production domestically in the United States. We have a variety of things to do to help technologically to increase the oil production

from wells in the continental United States now.

But the sad fact is, we cannot rely simply on oil production as an only or major source of solving this problem. The reason is that while we consume 25 percent of the world's oil, there is only 3 percent of the world's oil reserves in the continental United States. We use 25 percent, but we only have 3 percent of the world's reserves.

The Creator did not put enough dead dinosaurs under America to solve this problem simply by oil production. That is why we cannot rely on the Arctic, which is only about somewhere between 6 months' and a year's worth of production, and which would not be on line for 10 to 12 years, in any event.

There are two pieces of this puzzle that my friends across the aisles left out. Number one, they talk about this, that they will only put a 10,000-acre imprint or footprint on this beautiful area. I have been to Prudhoe Bay, and I can tell the Members that it looks more like New Jersey than it does Yellowstone National Park. We do not need that in the Arctic wilderness refuge.

They say it is only 10,000 acres on this, what they call the imprint where the industrial sector would meet the tundra. The problem is, everything is built in Alaska on stilts, and the only thing they count in that 10,000 acres is where the stilts touch the ground. It is sort of like measuring how much your furniture in your office covers your office by where the little corner of your desk leg touches the tile. That is a gross distortion. This place is going to look like an industrial production plant if this wildlife refuge is destroyed by making it into an oil facility.

I realize that not a lot of Americans are going to see the Arctic wilderness, wildlife refuge. It is very remote. But I think a lot of people think of this sort of like the Mona Lisa. A lot of Americans will not see it, and maybe it is only like putting a little small mustache on the Mona Lisa to put this 10,000 acre industrial plant; but it is a mustache, nonetheless, and it would not look good on the Mona Lisa, and it is not going to look good on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The best argument I heard about that is from a young environmentalist constituent of mine from Bainbridge Island, Washington, his name is Sam Zuckerman. Mr. Zuckerman told me that in his view, we ought to leave it for the kids and our grandkids. I think Mr. Zuckerman is right, that we should do so. I think that is the American sentiment.

I also may note that the people who live in the area are divided on this issue. The native Americans who live in the Arctic village who depend on the caribou herds, which potentially could be threatened by this development, are adamantly opposed to this. But we ought to know this, this refuge belongs to all Americans, not to any one of us. All Americans should have something

to say on this. All Americans ought to have the opportunity to give this spectacular place to their children and to their grandchildren.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just hope that in the next day or two while we are talking about energy in this Chamber that our effort to have this new Apollo energy project will be joined by some of our Republican colleagues.

We ask for their assistance in passing this, because America needs something more than half measures. We cannot break our addiction to oil with baby steps. We cannot solve the global warming problem with baby steps. We cannot grow the U.S. economy by these half measures that are now proposed in the Republican bill.

□ 2300

It is time to embrace and use the American talent for technological innovation. And it is time for the U.S. Congress to recognize both the challenge and the promise of what America can do when it comes to developing these new technologies.

There is a group in Lake Union, Washington called MagnaDrive, some former people from Boeing run it, and they have developed an electric motor coupling device which can increase the efficiency of an electric motor of about 30 percent. A fellow came up with this technology literally in his garage from Port Angeles, Washington, and now they are selling this to various building companies for their air conditioning systems to improve their electric efficiency.

We are going to solve this problem by 10,000 new inventions like that, by asking Americans in their garages, in their large corporate research and development facilities, to bring us into the next century. So I hope tomorrow or the next day we will indeed adopt this new Apollo energy project to give us, not an energy program for the last century, but one for the next century that is befitting the can-do talents of the American people.

UPDATING THE WAR WITH IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes or until the hour of midnight, whichever comes first.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me, and I will not take the full hour, but I rise this evening to discuss and put on the record some concerns about the current war and about where we are going and some problems that we will face in the future, and I hope to lay these comments on the record so that our colleagues can use them for the basis of discussion and perhaps action over the next several weeks and the rest of this session.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, what we saw today on our national television

around the world is a complete vindication of the efforts of our President, our Secretary of Defense, our Secretary of State, the National Security Advisor, and most importantly our military. We heard nothing but shrill rhetoric coming out of this city, and in some cases coming out of this body, from those who said that military action was not justified and that it would not be successful.

Now, granted we have not completed this action, Mr. Speaker, but here we are 3 weeks after the actual military conflict as begun and we now have secured a major portion of Iraq and the capital city of Baghdad. Saddam Hussein is on the run. He either has been killed or he is hiding like a coward and is looking for a way out, perhaps in the neighboring country of Syria.

But, Mr. Speaker, through all of this our military has performed in an absolutely astounding manner. The brave men and women of America who went over to serve have done an absolutely fantastic job. Our hearts and our sympathies go out to those family members of those brave Americans and British troops who paid the ultimate price and to those hundreds who have been injured and have received casualties because of this conflict.

But in the end, Mr. Speaker, the plan established by our Pentagon leaders was a valid plan, is a valid plan, and, in fact, has accomplished not only what we could have in our wildest dreams imagined and expected, but it has even surpassed our expectations in the success, in the efforts to secure the oil fields, to open the port facilities, to prevent missiles from being lobbed into Israel and Jordan and Kuwait which we knew the Iraqis wanted to do, to show the people of Iraq in all the cities that we are there not to dominate or take over their country but rather to liberate them and eventually turn the country back to them so they can elect their own leaders in free and fair elections.

Mr. Speaker, as well as things are going we must also look to where we are going to the future. And I mention that because we need to continue to pursue several other issues. The first of which is the request to convene a war crimes tribunal, not just to hold Saddam Hussein accountable but to hold the leaders of his regime accountable.

Several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation which has received scores of Members who have co-sponsored it to create such a war crimes tribunal. Yesterday, Senators SPECTER and BAYH and I announced the reintroduction of a concurrent resolution between the House and the Senate that calls for this war crimes tribunal. We hope to have this legislation passed both bodies within a matter of weeks. And the legislation specifically focuses not just on the well-documented war crimes of Saddam Hussein himself, but also of those leaders in his entourage and those military leaders and those military police and thug leaders who